

REMARKS

§103 rejections

In the 18 June 2008 Office Action claims 125 - 150 are rejected under §103 as being obvious given U.S. Patent 5,812,988 (hereinafter, Sandretto) in view of U.S. Patent 5,361,201 (hereinafter Jost). The Examiner has cited Sandretto and Jost as references. The Assignee respectfully traverses the rejections for obviousness in several ways. First, by noting that the claim rejections are not in compliance with the Administrative Procedures Act and are therefore moot. Second, by noting the claim rejections are non-statutory. Third, by noting that the Office Action has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness.

In particular the cited combination of documents fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness for claims 125 – 150 because the cited combination does not teach or suggest one or more of the limitations for every rejected claim. *MPEP 2143.03 provides that: to establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art (In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974)).* One limitation missing from the cited combination is induction which affects all claims.

§ 101 rejections

In the 18 June 2008 office action, claims 125 - 150 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being unpatentable because the Examiner alleges that the disclosed invention lacks patentable utility. The Assignee will respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 125 - 150 under §101 in two ways. First, by noting that the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of non utility. Second, by noting that the assertions regarding the alleged lack of utility are not in compliance with the requirements of the Administrative Procedures Act and are therefore moot. Third by noting that the claimed inventions transform transaction and text data into a different state or thing.

As mentioned previously, the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of non utility for rejected claims 125 - 150. *MPEP 2164.07 states “the examiner has the initial burden of challenging an asserted utility. Only after the examiner has provided evidence showing that one of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably doubt the asserted utility does the burden shift to the applicant to provide rebuttal evidence sufficient to convince one of ordinary skill in the art of the invention's asserted utility. In re Brana, 51 F.3d 1560, 1566, 34 USPQ2d 1436, 1441 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (citing In re Bundy, 642 F.2d 430, 433, 209 USPQ 48, 51 (CCPA 1981)).* The

Assignee respectfully submits that the Examiner has not provided any evidence to support his assertions. Instead, he has simply made a series of arbitrary and capricious statements.

As noted previously, the second way the Assignee will traverse the § 101 rejections of claims 125 - 150 is by noting that the assertions regarding the alleged lack of utility are not in compliance with the requirements of the Administrative Procedures Act and are therefore moot. In *Dickinson v. Zurko*, 119 S. Ct. 1816, 50 USPQ2d 1930 (1999), the Supreme Court held that the appropriate standard of review of USPTO findings of fact are the standards set forth in the Administrative Procedure Act ("APA") at 5 U.S.C. 706 (1994). The APA provides two standards for review – an arbitrary and capricious standard and a substantial evidence standard. The Assignee respectfully submits that the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection of claims 125 - 150 in the instant Office Action fails under both standards. It fails under the substantial evidence standard because as detailed above no evidence was presented. The Examiner is undoubtedly unwilling to make any specific allegations because all of the specific allegations made in the past have proved to be incorrect. It fails under the arbitrary and capricious standard because the U.S.P.T.O. has found similar claims to be patentable when presented by a large company as shown in the Table below:

Comparison of Patent 7,283,982 and application 10/743,417
7,283,982 Claim 1. A predictive model method, comprising: receiving first input data into an initial model to develop an initial model output; receiving second input data and said initial model output as inputs into a first boosting stage to develop an improvement to said initial model output, said second input data comprising one of said first input data, data not included in said first input data, and a combination thereof; and outputting a model output resulting from a final boosting stage being one of: said first boosting stage; and a final one of boosting stages successively receiving model output data from a preceding boosting stage.

10/743,417 Claim 125. (currently amended) A computer-implemented predictive model method, comprising:

receiving first input data into a plurality of initial predictive models to develop an initial model configuration by selecting a best fit initial predictive model using a tournament after a training of each predictive model type is completed;

receiving an input data set from said initial model configuration and a second input data as inputs into a second, induction model stage to develop an improvement to said initial model configuration as an output, said second input data comprising one of said first input data, data not included in said first input data, and a combination thereof; and

receiving said second model stage output as an input into a third predictive model stage to develop and output a final predictive model

where said final predictive model supports a regression analysis.

§ 112 First Paragraph Rejections

In the 18 June 2008 Office Action the Examiner has rejected claims 125 - 150 under 35 U.S.C. §112 first paragraph as lacking a written description that would enable those of average skill in the art to make and use the claimed invention. Specifically, the Examiner has made an unsupported allegation that the specification requires subjective judgments and lack a clear set of steps that allegedly would make it difficult to implement the invention.

The Assignee will respectfully traverse the §112 first paragraph rejection of claims 125 - 150 in three ways. First, by noting that the Office Action has failed to establish a prima facie case that the specification does not meet the requirements of §112 first paragraph. Second, by noting that the assertions regarding the alleged lack of written description are not in compliance with the both standards of the Administrative Procedures Act and are therefore moot. Third by noting the rejections are non-statutory.

As mentioned previously, the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case that the specification does not meet the requirements of §112 first paragraph. MPEP 2163 states that:

“A description as filed is presumed to be adequate, unless or until sufficient evidence or reasoning to the contrary has been presented by the examiner to rebut the presumption. See, e.g., In re Marzocchi, 439 F.2d 220, 224, 169 USPQ 367, 370 (CCPA 1971). The examiner, therefore, must have a reasonable basis to challenge the adequacy of the written description. The examiner has the initial burden of presenting by a preponderance of evidence why a person skilled in the art would not recognize in an applicant's disclosure a description of the invention defined by the claims. Wertheim, 541 F.2d at 263, 191 USPQ at 97. In rejecting a claim, the

examiner must set forth express findings of fact regarding the above analysis which support the lack of written description conclusion. These findings should:

(A) Identify the claim limitation at issue; and

(B) Establish a prima facie case by providing reasons why a person skilled in the art at the time the application was filed would not have recognized that the inventor was in possession of the invention as claimed in view of the disclosure of the application as filed. A general allegation of "unpredictability in the art" is not a sufficient reason to support a rejection for lack of adequate written description."

The arguments presented by the Examiner fail to establish the prima facie case required to sustain a §112 first paragraph rejection for a single claim in at least three ways:

1. the first way the 18 June 2008 Office Action fails to establish the prima facie case that the specification does not meet the requirements of §112 first paragraph is that the Examiner has not identified any reasons why a person skilled in the art at the time the application was filed would not have recognized that the inventor was in possession of the invention as claimed. To the contrary, there is substantial evidence that the comments regarding the written description were provided by individuals and an organization that lacks the necessary skill in the relevant arts;
2. the second way the 18 June 2008 Office Action fails to establish the prima facie case that the specification does not meet the requirements of §112 first paragraph is that the Examiner has only made a general allegations (See prior 35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejection of Claims discussion); and
3. the third way the 18 June 2008 Office Action fails to establish a prima facie case that the specification does not meet the requirements of §112 first paragraph is that the Examiner has not identified the claim limitation(s) at issue.

The Assignee respectfully submits that the assertion that the specification does not meet the requirements of §112 first paragraph also fail under both standards of the APA. First, as detailed above, the Examiner has not provided any evidence to support these allegations. As a result, the §112 first paragraph rejection of claims 125 - 150 fails under the substantial evidence standard. The Examiner is undoubtedly unwilling to make any specific allegations because all of the specific allegations made in the past have proved to be incorrect. Second, a comparison of the method disclosed in the instant application with the description contained in a recently issued patent shows that the rejections fail under the arbitrary and capricious standard. This is because instant application has no identifiable subjectivity in model development while considerable subjectivity appears to be present in a recently issued patent for completing similar tasks:

Summary of 10/743,417	Summary of 7,283,982 filed in 2003
1. Transform raw data into indicators using pre-programmed functions and Linus/AQ algorithms	1. Use <u>any</u> technique to derive a basic model
2. Develop an initial model using the raw and transformed data as inputs by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) creating parallel models using different specified algorithms, b) using stepwise regression to identify the best set of input variables for the models for each algorithm type, and c) selecting the three best algorithm type models from b) 	2. Develop an initial model by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) deriving features from the input to the basic model using <u>any</u> current transform regression algorithm, and b) using stepwise regression to select the input features for the initial regression model
3. Refine the variable selection from 2b) for the three best models from 2c) and then transform the resulting set of input variables into summaries using different specified algorithms.	3. Complete a non-linear transformation of an explanatory input feature(s) from the initial model.
	4. Use the transformed input features to create a new linear regression model
4. Use the best summary of transformed data from 3 to create a final regression model	5. Combine the output of the new linear regression model with the output of the initial model and use the sum to provide a final model for the current iteration
	6. Repeat steps 3 through 5 indefinitely

As shown above, both the instant application and issued patent methods rely on stepwise regression for the input variable selection step. The use of stepwise regression for variable selection has been judged to be obvious (see 103 rejection discussion) and/or too subjective in the instant application and in related applications that develop models (it was equated with the use of fear and emotion in an Office Action for application 09/688,983) while the issued patents reliance on the exact same technique was judged to be novel and concrete when used in model development.

Furthermore, the written description for the issued patent appears to be more subjective than the written description for the Asset Reliance application because: one step in the issued patent method calls for the use of “any” model, another step in the issued patent method calls for the use of “any” current transform regression algorithm, and the number of iterations is not specified. By way of contrast, the instant application specifically identifies the algorithms used

at every step of the model development process and does not use an open ended model development process.

While no rebuttal is required, the Assignee also notes that a declaration has been provided which also could be used to provide a complete rebuttal of the unsubstantiated allegations contained in the 18 June 2008 Office Action regarding a lack of written description.

§ 112 Second Paragraph Rejections

In the 18 June 2008 Office Action the Examiner has rejected claims 125 - 150 under 35 U.S.C. §112 first paragraph as lacking a written description that would enable those of average skill in the art to make and use the claimed invention.

The Assignee will respectfully traverse the §112 second paragraph rejection of claims 125 - 150 in three ways. First, by noting that the Office Action has failed to establish a prima facie case that the specification does not meet the requirements of §112 second paragraph. Second, by noting that the assertions regarding the alleged lack of written description are not in compliance with the both standards of the Administrative Procedures Act and are therefore moot. Third by noting the rejections are non-statutory.

As mentioned previously, the first way the Assignee will traverse the 35 U.S.C. §112 second paragraph rejection of claims 125 - 150 will be by noting that the arguments presented by the Examiner fail to establish the prima facie case required to sustain a §112 second paragraph rejection. *MPEP 2173.02 states that: definiteness of claim language must be analyzed, not in a vacuum, but in light of:*

(A) *The content of the particular application disclosure;*
(B) *The teachings of the prior art; and*
(C) *The claim interpretation that would be given by one possessing the ordinary level of skill in the pertinent art at the time the invention was made.*

In reviewing a claim for compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, the examiner must consider the claim as a whole to determine whether the claim apprises one of ordinary skill in the art of its scope and, therefore, serves the notice function required by 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, by providing clear warning to others as to what constitutes infringement of the patent. See, e.g., Solomon v. Kimberly-Clark Corp., 216 F.3d 1372, 1379, 55 USPQ2d 1279, 1283 (Fed. Cir. 2000). See also In re Larsen, No. 01-1092 (Fed. Cir. May 9, 2001). In the case of claims 125 - 150 the Examiner has failed to establish the prima facie case that the

specification does not meet the requirements of §112 second paragraph in four ways for every rejected claim. The four ways are:

1. by failing to interpret the claims in light of the specification,
2. by failing to provide any evidence that someone of average skill in the relevant arts would have difficulty interpreting the claims,
3. by failing to establish that the limitation(s) in the claims fail to describe the invention and/or
4. by failing to consider the claim as a whole.

The detail cited under the discussion of the §112 first paragraph rejection discussion of failure to comply with the APA also supports the arguments regarding the APA under this section.

Statement under 37 CFR 1.111

37 CFR 1.111 requires that the basis for amendments to the claims be pointed out after consideration of the references cited or the objections made. 37 CFR 1.111 states in part that:

In amending in response to a rejection of claims in an application or patent undergoing reexamination, the applicant or patent owner must clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. He or she must also show how the amendments avoid such references or objections.

The Assignee notes that this requirement is not relevant to the instant application because, as detailed above, there are no references or objections to avoid. Having said that, the Assignee notes that the primary reasons the prior set of claims were amended to put the claims in final form for allowance and issue.

Request for affidavits under 37 C.F.R. 1.104

Because the 18 June 2008 Office Action contains no evidence, the claim rejections rely entirely on the personal knowledge of the Examiner and/or one or more other employees of the Office. 37 C.F.R. 1.104 provides that:

When a rejection in an application is based on facts within the personal knowledge of an employee of the Office, the data shall be as specific as possible, and the reference must be supported, when called for by the applicant, by the affidavit of such employee, and

such affidavit shall be subject to contradiction or explanation by the affidavits of the applicant and other persons.

Accordingly, the Assignee requests that an affidavit detailing the facts within the personal knowledge of any employee(s) of the Office that were used to support statements to the effect that the written description and the claim limitations are somehow defective. In particular, the affidavit should explain why:

1. a written description that specifies all the algorithms used in all steps is indefinite while a written description that relies on the use of any algorithm or modeling method is considered definite;
2. why an open ended model development process is considered definite while a method with a fixed number of defined steps is considered indefinite; and
3. why the use of stepwise regression to select input variables is considered subjective and obvious when disclosed by the Assignee for a specific domain while being considered concrete and novel when disclosed by a large company 3 years later for use in any domain.

The Assignee also requests that an affidavit detailing the combinations and/or modifications of teachings that the Examiner and other personnel at the U.S.P.T.O. who will be involved in the review of this application, its anticipated continuation and the anticipated appeal have made without the assistance of a patent specification or any other teaching, motivation or suggestion be prepared and forwarded to the Assignee. For each listed combination, the teaching(s) and their source should be identified. The product name for any commercialized combinations of teachings should also be included in the affidavit. If there are none, then the Assignee is also requesting an affidavit detailing the statutory basis for allowing individuals with a well documented lack of skill in the relevant arts to author 103 and/or 112 rejections.

The Assignee hereby also requests an affidavit detailing the statutory basis for using different standards to review similar inventions based on company size.

Copending applications

Under the provisions of MPEP § 2001.06(b), the Examiner is hereby advised of the following copending U.S. Patent Application(s) which have claims pending that may be viewed as similar (with or without justification) to the pending claims of the instant application.

Application(s)	Pending claims that may viewed as being similar to the pending claims	Summary of claims
10/645,099	49 – 56	Use of transform regression models

Office Actions for application that are and/or were copending that may be relevant include the 11/21/2000 Office Action for 08/999,245, the 10/20/2006 Office Action for 08/999,245, the 02/20/2007 Office Action for 08/999,245, the 09/10/2007 Office Action for 08/999,245, the 11/26/2001 Office Action for 09/293,336, the 01/06/2004 Office Action for 09/688,982, the 08/28/2006 Office Action for 09/688,982, the 12/24/2003 Office Action for 09/688,983, the 06/15/2004 Office Action for 09/688,983, the 02/24/2005 Office Action for 09/688,983, the 03/09/2006 Office Action for 09/688,983, the 01/03/2007 Office Action for 09/688,983, the 10/11/2005 Office Action for 09/761,670, the 05/09/2006 Office Action for 09/761,670, the 01/03/2007 Office Action for 09/761,670, the 05/03/2004 Office Action for 09/761,671, the 11/18/2004 Office Action for 09/761,671, the 09/30/2005 Office Action for 09/761,671, the 06/13/2006 Office Action for 09/761,671, the 10/06/2004 Office Action for 09/764,068, the 07/01/2005 Office Action for 09/764,068, the 12/30/2005 Office Action for 09/764,068, the 07/12/2006 Office Action for 09/764,068, the 08/23/2007 Office Action for 09/764,068, the 05/23/2003 Office Action for 09/940,450, the 11/24/2003 Office Action for 09/940,450, the 05/03/2006 Office Action for 09/940,450, the 09/07/2006 Office Action for 10/012,375, the 02/27/2007 Office Action for 10/012,375, the 08/23/2007 Office Action for 10/012,375, the 02/25/2008 Office Action for 10/012,375, the 07/12/2006 Office Action for 10/025,794, the 11/14/2007 Office Action for 10/025,794, the 03/31/2008 Office Action for 10/025,794, the 02/14/2007 Office Action for 10/036,522, the 11/14/2007 Office Action for 10/036,522, the 02/27/2007 Office Action for 10/097,344, the 08/23/2007 Office Action for 10/097,344, the 06/26/2007 Office Action for 10/166,758, the 7/11/2007 Office Action for 10/237,021, the 2/06/2008 Office Action for 10/237,021, the 12/20/2004 Office Action for 10/282,113, the 10/20/2005 Office Action for 10/282,113, the 02/24/2006 Office Action for 10/282,113, the 05/26/2006 Office Action for 10/282,113, the 03/27/2008 Office Action for 10/287,586, the 08/08/2003 Office Action for 10/012,374, the 01/21/2004 Office Action for 10/012,374, the 05/24/2004 Office Action for 10/012,374, the 08/23/2004 Office Action for 10/012,374, the 07/06/2005 Office Action for 10/012,374, the 05/22/2006 Office Action for 10/012,374, the 04/09/2007 Office Action for 10/046,094, the 12/04/2007 Office Action for 10/046,094, the 08/11/2004 Office Action for 10/329,172, the 06/08/2005 Office Action for 10/329,172, the

12/02/2005 Office Action for 10/329,172, the 07/24/2006 Office Action for 10/329,172, the 12/16/2003 Office Action for 10/441,385, the 11/02/2005 Office Action for 10/441,385, the 06/02/2006 Office Action for 10/441,385, the 11/03/2006 Office Action for 10/441,385, the 02/27/2007 Office Action for 10/441,385, the 08/10/2007 Office Action for 10/441,385, the 07/02/2004 Office Action for 10/674,861, the 09/26/2006 Office Action for 10/645,099, the 02/27/2007 Office Action for 10/645,099. the 01/09/2008 Office Action for 10/645,099. the 02/06/2007 Office Action for 10/743,616, the 07/26/2007 Office Action for 10/743,616, the 02/11/2007 Office Action for 10/743,616, the 04/12/2005 Office Action for 10/746,673, the 07/10/2006 Office Action for 10/746,673, the 01/23/2007 Office Action for 10/746,673, the 02/27/2007 Office Action for 10/746,673, the 11/20/2007 Office Action for 10/746,673, the 02/14/2008 Office Action for 10/747,471, the 08/09/2007 Office Action for 10/821,504, the 6/27/2007 Office Action for 11/360,087 the 11/01/2007 Office Action for 11/360,087, the 6/17/2008 Office Action for 10/750,792, the 6/18/2008 Office Action for 11/278,419 and the 6/06/2008 Office Communication for 10/441,385. In almost all cases these Office Actions and Communications are available from the U.S.P.T.O. Internet File Wrapper system.

Reservation of rights

The Assignee hereby explicitly reserves the right to present the previously modified and/or canceled claims for re-examination in their original format. The cancellation or modification of pending claims to put the instant application in a final form for allowance and issue is not to be construed as a surrender of subject matters covered by the original claims before their cancellation or modification.

Conclusion

The pending claims are of a form and scope for allowance. Prompt notification thereof is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Asset Trust, Inc.

/B.J. Bennett/

B.J. Bennett, President
Date: June 27, 2008